

To: Skophammer, Stephanie[SKOPHAMMER.STEPHANIE@EPA.GOV]; Enos, Cassandra@DWR[Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov]
Cc: Vendlinski, Tim[vendlinski.tim@epa.gov]; Banonis, Michelle[mbanonis@usbr.gov]; Foresman, Erin[Foresman.Erin@epa.gov]
From: Hagler, Tom
Sent: Thur 3/19/2015 11:16:42 PM
Subject: RE: EPA Action Item discussion follow-up

I will reiterate what Stephanie said. Although the summary is an accurate portrayal of the technical discussions, it does not appear to reflect much, if anything, on our discussions with DWR and DOI about the new direction (Alternative 4a). For example, my discussion with Jim Moose suggested that the discussion of uncertainty would show up, if at all, in the final document, not in the next iteration, given the change in the proposed project moves away from the 50 year permit idea.

We look forward to seeing how you mesh these issues with the new direction.

From: Skophammer, Stephanie
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2015 3:57 PM
To: Enos, Cassandra@DWR
Cc: Vendlinski, Tim; Banonis, Michelle; Foresman, Erin; Hagler, Tom
Subject: RE: EPA Action Item discussion follow-up

Hi Cassandra-

Thanks for your note and for looking into that item. We would like to attach the following short clarifier which I know is clear to us who attended the meeting, but just in case this Action Item Summary is ever used by someone who did not attend the meetings. It was included on the individual meeting summaries previously, but didn't get carried over to this one.

EPA Note: Some of these notes refer to "agreements" or "conclusions." At this point, EPA is responding to tentative proposals for revisions suggested by the lead agencies or its consultants. Any agreements or conclusions referenced in this document are similarly tentative. EPA will base its Section 309 review on the actual released contents of the public revised DEIS and/or supplemental DEIS (whichever approach is taken).

Since things seem to be rapidly changing, I just want to make sure that this Action Item list accurately reflects what came out of the technical meetings, previous EPA letter, etc. but not necessarily the new direction, since we are not sure all that the new direction may entail.

Thank you for all your coordination,

Stephanie

Stephanie Skophammer

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 9

Environmental Review Section (ENF-4-2)

75 Hawthorne St.

San Francisco, CA 94105

(415) 972-3098

From: Enos, Cassandra@DWR [<mailto:Cassandra.Enos@water.ca.gov>]

Sent: Wednesday, March 18, 2015 2:28 PM

To: Skophammer, Stephanie

Cc: Foresman, Erin L SPK; Vendlinski, Tim; Banonis, Michelle

Subject: EPA Action Item discussion follow-up

Stephanie – Thanks for taking the time to review and discuss the revised Action Item summary. Per our discussion, I revised the document and attached a clean version. I did follow-up on your question regarding deletion of the following action item:

- o A discussion regarding the proposed project relationship to the abundance of LFS relative to existing

conditions.

The item was deleted as it was specific to the benefits of the high outflow scenario to LFS in the context of Section 10. However, in the RDEIR/SDEIS we fully intend to include an evaluation of the impact of the proposed project operations on LFS abundance and, if necessary, identify appropriate mitigation measures under CEQA/NEPA.

Hope this is helpful. Please let me know if you have any additional questions/comments.

Thanks, Cassandra

Cassandra Enos-Nobriga

Environmental Management

Bay-Delta Conservation Plan

Department of Water Resources

901 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814

Office: (916) 651-0178

Mobile: (916) 835-6981